

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA  
(Acting as Academic Senate)

June 26, 1973, 3:00 p.m., University Union 220

- I. Approval of Minutes
- II. Executive Committee Summer Role
- III. Unfinished Business:
  - A. Senate and Committee Assignments - Alberti
  - B. President's Actions - Olsen
  - C. Senate Office Status - Alberti
- IV. New Business:
  - A. Statewide Senate Report - Anderson (Attachment 1)
  - B. Differential Admissions Standards - Alberti
  - C. Personnel Policies Committee Report - Coyes
    - 1. Librarian Personnel Plan (Attachment 2)
    - 2. Sabbatical Leave Policy (See Coyes' memo, June 6, to Academic Senate Executive Committee)
    - 3. Catalog Faculty Directory (Attachment 3)
    - 4. Student Evaluation of Faculty (Attachment 4)
  - D. Baccalaureate Unit Requirements - Andrews
  - E. Faculty Workload Reporting (Attachment 5)
  - F. Faculty Participation in Commencement (Attachment 6)
  - G. Selection and Evaluation of Major Administrators - Alberti
- V. Announcements:
  - A. Executive Order 176 (Attachment 7)
  - B. Annual Reports of Committees - Rosen
  - C. Stanislaus S. C. Faculty Statement - Alberti
  - D. Fall Conference - Alberti
  - E. Next Meeting

ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

SALARY SCHEDULE REFERENDUM

WITH:

17 campuses reporting

3,560 ballots cast

38% of eligible faculty casting ballots

RESULTS:	YES	NO
1970 Schedule Fully Funded	41%	59%
1970 Schedule Partially Funded	26%	74%
Retain Current Schedule	51%	49%
Study to develop a Structure different from current and 1970	58%	42%

TENTATIVE CONCLUSION:

1. Faculty rejects 1970 structure fully or partially funded.
2. Faculty wishes to retain current schedule until a fresh study produces a structure different from anything yet developed.

CCA:kec

June 7, 1973

ATTACHMENT 1

Barton Olsen, Chairman  
Academic Senate

May 16, 1973

Robert Alberti ✓

Frank Coyes

C  
O  
P  
Y

The Personnel Policies Committee unanimously recommends that the Academic Senate support the attached resolution regarding the Librarian Personnel Plan. A similar resolution was taken some time ago by the Academic Senate, so it is our hope that the Executive Committee acting this summer will adopt this resolution and submit it to President Kennedy.

Attachment

## LIBRARIAN PERSONNEL PLAN

## RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Office of the Chancellor issued a new Librarian Personnel Plan (FSA 73-25, March 16, 1973) which does not achieve equivalency of status with the teaching faculty, and

WHEREAS, this plan does not meet the professional aspirations of the librarians for full faculty status which has the support of the statewide Academic Senate, except for rank and class, (resolution AS 90-67/FA, October 20, 1967) and the endorsement of faculty organizations, such as AAUP, UPC, AFT, CCUFA, and CSEA, and

WHEREAS, this plan imposes added responsibilities and more stringent requirements for promotion but does not offer faculty equivalency in return, and

WHEREAS, contrary to democratic processes, librarian participation was not solicited in the final stages of the development of this plan, and great secrecy concerning its contents was maintained to prevent any input from librarians, and

WHEREAS, since under this plan librarians remain in the academic-related job category it will be difficult to obtain promotions for librarians in non-supervisory positions, and promotions will have to be approved by the Chancellor's Office and not locally, as is the case with the faculty; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University concurs with the librarians that in denying them equivalent faculty status this personnel plan fails to recognize the vital role played by librarians in the educational process; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate endorses the librarians' efforts to bring about a revision of the new plan in consultation with the librarians of the CSUC system; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate supports the librarians in their desire to have all librarian promotions and reclassifications approved on campus, and requests the President to ask the Chancellor's Office that he be granted the authority to do so.]

X be it further

RESOLVED: that this resolution be submitted to the President of CPSUSIO, the Academic Senate CSUC, the Academic Senates of each of the CSUC campuses.

Barton Olsen, Chairman  
Academic Senate

May 16, 1973

Robert Alberti ✓  
Dave Cook

Frank Coyes

C  
O  
P  
Y

The Personnel Policies Committee recommends that for publication in the University Catalog for 1973-75, the current practice for faculty write-ups be continued.

Barton Olsen, Chairman  
Academic Senate

May 21, 1973

Robert Alberti

Frank Coyes, Chairman  
Personnel Policies Committee

*Coyes*

C  
O  
P  
Y

The Personnel Policies Committee is currently studying the various procedures and evaluation instruments used by the individual schools for evaluation of faculty by students. To date, information has been gathered from the schools in the form of instruction sheets, questionnaires and response sheets and, as a preliminary step, we have studied briefly this information from the Schools of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Architecture and Environmental Design, and Business and Social Sciences. We have on hand for study, procedures, and questions for Engineering and Technology and are awaiting this information from Communicative Arts and Humanities, Human Development and Education, and Science and Mathematics.

During our early discussions, it became evident that for the 1972-73 academic year, only the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources had completed the initial evaluation during the fall quarter and the official evaluation during the winter quarter. Several schools ran trial evaluations in the fall or winter quarter and are planning the official evaluations at the end of the spring quarter. At least one school had not planned to run evaluations till the fall quarter 1973-74.

As a result of incomplete information, it is our recommendation that the Personnel Policies Committee continue the study during the 1973-74 academic year when it is hoped that more complete information and results will be available for study and a more accurate assessment and evaluation can be made by the Committee with recommendations being made toward the end of the 1973-74 academic year.

Cummins, Ericson, Fisher, Gibson,  
Hasslein, Servatius, and Valpey

May 29, 1973

Dale W. Andrews

Kennedy  
Dunigan  
Coats  
Landreth

Voss  
Boche  
Cook  
West

\*Alberti  
Anderson, Roy

Faculty Workload Reporting for 1973-74

The information contained in my October 31, 1972 memo of four pages is still applicable in all essential respects, and I urge you to inform your department heads both now and in the fall of the points covered as we prepare for the 1973-74 academic year.

One statement in the memo under item #3 regarding the reporting of the individual faculty member's workload needs to be up-dated. The "new method of reporting" referred to as a system level proposal was found unacceptable by the Statewide Academic Senate. As a result the details of the reporting method will remain unchanged.

Attached is a copy for your use of AP&RP 73-35 which announces the above decision. It transmits an Interim Faculty Workload Formula which is essentially the old faculty staffing formula. The paragraph which encourages a flexible approach to class sizes on the campus seems to avoid the main point which is: YOU CANNOT MEET YOUR BUDGETED FTE WHILE MAINTAINING OLD STAFFING FORMULA CLASS SIZES AND 12 W.T.U. TEACHING LOADS. See item #9 of my October 31 memo.

Please see that this information is effectively disseminated through your organizations.

Attachments:

- 1) DWA October 31, 1972 memo
- \*2) AP&RP 73-35

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES  
Office of the Chancellor  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90036

May 16, 1973

AP&RP 73-35

TO: Presidents

FROM: W. B. Langsdorf  
Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs

RECEIVED  
MAY 18 1973

SUBJECT: Faculty Workload Reporting for 1973-74 ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT

Reporting of faculty workload for 1973-74 will continue to be based upon the factors contained in the old Faculty Staffing Formula (see attachment), since revision of faculty workload measurement (see AP&RP 73-14) is still under discussion. Faculty workload norms will continue to be based upon the Chancellor's memoranda on Utilization of Faculty (November 1, 1971, and November 30, 1972) and AP 72-20, Assigned Time Code List (April 18, 1972).

It is intended that workload definition should not, in and of itself, serve as a basis for significant alterations in historic class size norms; a flexible approach to class size by the campus is encouraged where it is consistent with the optimal use of faculty skills and is not detrimental to the quality of instructional programs.

WBL:ln

Attachment

Copies to: Academic Vice Presidents  
Deans of Academic Planning  
Chancellor's Staff



# Memorandum

To : Bob Alberti, Chairman-Elect  
Academic Senate

Date : June 6, 1973

File No.:

Copies :

From : Will Alexander *WHA*

Subject: Faculty Participation in Commencement

It has come to my attention in the last couple of years that there is a great deal of difference in the policies of the several schools in respect to participation of faculty in commencement exercises. I believe that we are at the stage when a standardized policy might be set forth. I therefore ask that this question be referred to an appropriate committee of the Academic Senate for study and report. To illustrate what I mean in respect to a possible policy, I will suggest something along the following lines:

1. Each member of the faculty is encouraged to participate regularly in the annual commencement exercises.
2. The participation of the faculty of any school and any department should not be less than one half of the number of full-time equivalent faculty assigned in any school or department.
3. No member of the faculty should be required to participate in commencement exercises more frequently than once in any two year period.
4. The above policies shall take effect beginning with the commencement exercises of 1974.

If invited, I would be pleased to further elaborate my ideas on a commencement policy to the appropriate committee.

ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

---

T R A N S C R I P T  
of  
Oral Presentation  
to  
Faculty & Staff Affairs Committee  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES CSUC

by

Wednesday,  
May 23, 1973

Charles C. Adams, Chairman  
ACADEMIC SENATE CSUC

I don't know whether we're going to be the first to do so, but the Academic Senate would like to file a "grievance," under this Executive Order 176 -- against the Order itself -- and we would like to do so on two of the grounds specified in the document.

The first ground is our contention that Executive Order No. 176 represents an arbitrary action based on a long-standing, well-documented administrative bias against faculty representation in grievances. The history of grievance procedures is fairly well known by most present, but I'll just tick through it very quickly. I've been on the Academic Senate for four years now and during that time we've had five Executive Orders dealing with grievances. Executive Order No. 80 was developed mainly by the Academic Senate; it allowed each person directly involved in a grievance to "select and have an advisor." Under Executive Order No. 112, and Order No. 150, as I think most of you know, a faculty member could have a representative in grievance only if he filed a formal claim that he was incompetent on emotional, mental or physical grounds to represent himself. We objected to that provision a number of times and were not able to get what we considered the rather obnoxious regulation removed. As so often happens in cases of this kind, (though I do not prefer such a move but am sometimes sympathetic with it) people go to Sacramento to get what they cannot achieve on Wilshire Boulevard. The result of such a maneuver is the Harmer Bill, which provides by legislative mandate for representation for faculty in grievances. Executive Order No. 173 was developed first as a response to the Harmer Bill; it would have allowed a faculty member to have a representative of his choosing, but not an attorney. Then, as a result of the last Board meeting, the Monitoring Committee revised Order 173 so as now to allow representation by the choice of the faculty including attorneys. Now, it could appear on the surface that what some faculty have been striving for by way of representation has been achieved. I think probably that's the case. But something else has happened on the way to Order 176 which I want to call particular attention to. In every order up to and including Order 173, (even though under 173 a faculty member could have had a representative of his choosing, but not an attorney), the hearing was to have been conducted by a faculty grievance committee. Really, the only aspect of representation which has been changed in the movement from 173 to 176 is the addition of access to an attorney. One might have expected that, if there were any change in the conduct of the hearing, it would involve only a case in which an attorney is chosen. The Office of the General Counsel has stated that only when a faculty member chooses an attorney will it supply a corresponding attorney. Under such circumstances, having a hearing officer to superintend the attorneys might make sense. But what has happened in Order 176 is that the imposition of

Chairman Adams, ASCSUC  
 Presentation to FSA, BOT  
 May 23, 1973

the hearing officer has been extended to cover any case in which a faculty member has any kind of representative, including a lay colleague, if he so chooses, and along with that has come a more significant change. If I decide to represent myself in what may be my first grievance and face a Dean and an Academic Vice President who may already have the cumulative experience of participating in several grievance cases, I am entitled to what is described in the preface to 176 as the "traditional collegial grievance format." But if I ask anybody to represent me, the faculty grievance committee not only does not conduct the hearing, it can't even attend the hearing.

We feel that what's happened in 176 is not just an accommodation of attorneys with the superimposition of machinery to superintend attorneys, but rather a significant change with respect to the level and kind of faculty participation in the grievance process. Even as a member of the Monitoring Committee, and I said so in our recent meetings, I just can't understand this great leap. If I want to represent myself, the faculty committee can conduct the hearing, organize it, question witnesses, find facts, and make recommendations. If I bring my office-mate in to represent me, a great transformation occurs. The hearing suddenly becomes an "adversary" situation. I think it's somewhat naive to think that an adversary relationship is not inherent in all grievances. If I've been denied tenure or am not going to be retained in the University or haven't received a promotion I think I deserve, and I come formally to face the people who have denied me any of these benefits, an adversary relationship exists. The fact that I bring my office-mate to represent me doesn't make it so much more an adversary relationship that the whole world of the hearing has to be turned upside down. Moreover, I can't think that the faculty committee, just because my office-mate appears, suddenly becomes such a bunch of blithering ninnyes that they can't conduct the hearing -- indeed that so much machinery is needed to protect them that it's best not even to allow them to attend. I think we're confronted with a severe kind of over-kill here.

A much more reasonable way of revising 173, since in 176 the only change in representation was the addition of access to an attorney, would have been to provide mechanisms in response to the special implications of the presence of attorneys and not regress so as to say to the faculty member, in effect, "Alright, you have your representative, but if you want to be represented you're going to have to forego the participation of the faculty committee in hearing and conducting your case. That's the price you have to pay." In my view, the long-standing administrative bias against faculty members' having any representation in grievances has come home to roost with a vengeance.

We'd also like to file our grievance on the ground of procedural flaws in the development of Executive Order No. 176.

Leonard Mathy, who is chairman of our Faculty Affairs Committee, and I are members of the Monitoring Committee. As a matter of fact, I've been a member of the Monitoring Committee since its inception some two and a half years ago. We've been meeting for the last one and a half years,

Charles Adams, Chairman, ASCSUC  
Presentation to FSA, BOT  
May 23, 1973

and we've been operating during that period under what I believe to be a special kind of disadvantage. Very seldom has a full committee been present at a meeting. In the first year, one of the representatives of the Council of Presidents did not attend any of the meetings and another was understandably very often prevented from attending by inclement weather. What has happened as a result of this, in the some dozen meetings we've had, is that the faculty representatives spent from two to six hours working with a bare quorum on a particular aspect of the grievance procedures, only to come to the next meeting to rehash the material from the previous committee meeting. Sometimes all of the work and the agreements which have been reached in the most recent meeting have been discarded. In fact, such a loss has occurred twice in this process of adjusting Order 150 to the Harmer Bill. Since the March meeting of the Board, we've met two times. The first time we met the Trustees could not attend, so the members of staff and Academic Senate and the Presidents discussed the matter. We developed a compromise package and Mr. Sensenbrenner was instructed to come back to the Committee with the embodiment of that agreement in appropriate language. When Dr. Mathy and I arrived at the meeting of May 3rd, with the Trustees present, and the representation from the Presidents altered somewhat, it became apparent immediately that our purpose was not, as we had supposed, to review the agreements which had been struck at the previous meeting, but that we were to consider all the basic issues afresh. In rather short order, the faculty grievance committee was banned from the hearing in cases where a faculty member chooses representation, and the committee came dangerously close to mandating that the faculty grievance committee be denied access even to the tape recordings of the hearing. The overkill almost became a slaughter. If the Senate is to continue representation on the Monitoring Committee, we must be assured that attendance will be such, and the representatives sure enough of the positions of their constituencies, that we won't waste countless hours coming to agreements only to have them cast into the wastepaper basket between meetings or at subsequent meetings.

We do not expect to win the grievance, Mr. Chairman, because, as is typical of grievances in our system, our managers make the original decisions and then insist on the final word in appeals from these decisions. Like the ancient Greek slaves in the quarries of Syracuse, having done what men could, we will do what men must. We are not happy, though we may be for the time being resigned. One thing which consoles us is the fact that there have been five executive orders the last four years, with each one generally enduring somewhat less time than its predecessor. In fact, Executive Order No. 173 lasted only two months and eleven days. We think that Executive Order No. 176 contains the seeds of its own destruction. Its demands, in terms of availability of hearing officers, cost of hearing officers, and demands on the system's legal staff, are going to prove unbearable. The potential for grievances in this system is so great, and the resources of the faculty and the membership organizations so considerable, that we confidently expect Executive Order No. 176 to self-destruct in a very short period of time. So we're going now to sit, watch, and wait, assist where we can in its demise, and be ready to help pick up the pieces.